

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1-16 are the claims currently pending in the Application.

Claims 1-15 are amended to clarify features recited thereby and to remove extraneous reference numerals.

### ***Information Disclosure Statement***

Applicant thanks the Examiner for reviewing and considering the references cited in the Information Disclosure Statements filed on August 14, 2001 and on March 7th, 2002.

### ***Rejection of Claims 1-4, 6, 8, 9, 11, 12-15 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (e)***

Claims 1-4, 6, 8, 9, 11, 12-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Vo, U.S. Patent No. 6,795,444. This rejection is traversed.

According to an aspect of Applicant's claimed invention, a handover is provided between a transcoding proxy server and another a transcoding proxy server providing the format of content for a mobile device.<sup>1</sup>

For at least the following reasons, Applicant's claimed invention is neither anticipated by nor obvious from the cited references. By way of example, independent claims 1 and 6 require transferring to a second transcoding proxy the relaying of a communication session from the first transcoding proxy transcoding content provided to a format suitable for the mobile device.

Vo discloses the integration of voice over Internet Protocol (VoIP) telephone service for a cellular telephone infrastructure (POCS--Plain Old Cellular Service). (Vo, column 1, line 40 -

---

<sup>1</sup> The present discussion illustrates aspects of Applicant's claimed invention. Applicant does not represent that every embodiment of Applicant's claimed invention necessarily embodies or performs the solutions herein discussed.

column 2, line 39). Vo discloses handoff method between MSCs (Mobile Switching Centers), BSs (Base Stations or Radio Base Stations) and Gateways (Vo, Figs. 8 and 9; column 23 line 15 - column 24, line 47), the Gateways (GW) providing connection to the cellular system for voice over IP functionality.

Vo does not disclose or suggest transferring the relaying of a communication session from the first transcoding proxy transcoding content provided to a format suitable for the mobile device to a second transcoding proxy, as *inter alia* required by independent claims 1 in 6. First, Vo does not disclose or suggest a transcoding proxy server that transcodes content provided to a format suitable for the mobile device. As discussed, Vo is directed to providing voice over IP functionality for a cellular phone system infrastructure and is silent on a transcoding proxy server providing the functionality described.

Further, since Vo is silent on a transcoding proxy server providing such functionality, Vo is incapable of disclosing or suggesting transferring the relaying of the communication session between a first such transcoding proxy and a second such transcoding proxy, as further required by independent claims 1 in 6. Therefore, Vo does not disclose or suggest the recitations of independent claims 1 and 6.

Claims 2-4 depend from independent claim 1, and claims 8, 9, 11, 12-15 depend from independent claim 6. Therefore, claims 2-4, 8, 9, 11 and 12-15 incorporate novel and nonobvious features of their respective base claims and are patentably distinguishable over the prior art for at least the reasons that their respective base claims are patentably distinguishable over the prior art. Accordingly, this rejection should now be withdrawn.


***Rejection of Claim 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103***

Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being obvious from Vo in view of the Official Notice taken.

Claim 16 depends from independent claim 6, and thus incorporates novel and nonobvious features thereof. The Official Notice taken, even if permissible, is not alleged to cure the deficiencies of Vo as they relate to Applicant's invention as claimed in independent claims 6. Therefore, claim 16 is patentably distinguishable over the prior art for at least the reasons that independent claim 6 is patentably distinguishable over the prior art. Accordingly, this rejection should now be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing discussion, Applicant believes that the Application is now allowable, and respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider the rejections and allow the Application. Should the Examiner have any questions regarding this Amendment, or regarding the Application generally, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,



George Brieger  
Registration No. 52,652

SCULLY, SCOTT, MURPHY & PRESSER  
400 Garden City Plaza  
Suite 300  
Garden City, New York 11530  
(516) 742-4343 Ext. 503  
GB/ahs/ns